



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,289	09/08/2000	Matthew D. Saylor	13DV13218	3536

6111 7590 11/14/2002

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
ANDREW C HESS
GE AIRCRAFT ENGINES
ONE NEUMANN WAY M/D H17
CINCINNATI, OH 452156301

EXAMINER

LEE, RIP A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1713

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/658,289

Applicant(s)

SAYLOR ET AL.

Examiner

Rip A. Lee

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action follows a response filed on September 18, 2002 in which claim 1 was amended and new claims 22-25 were added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1713

4. Claims 1-4 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,390,658 to Graetz *et al.* for the same reasons set forth in the previous office action.

Briefly, Graetz *et al.* relates to coating compositions comprising latex (col. 7, line 19) prepared in distilled water (col. 7, line 34) with a solids content of 50-70 wt % (col. 3, line 53). Titanium dioxide is used as the pigment (col. 8, line 40). The composition may be applied by spraying (col. 6, line 56). Thus, the composition of the present invention is anticipated by the prior art.

Graetz *et al.* is silent with respect to the viscosity of the coating compositions. The claimed range of 50-400 cP is unexceptional, and this is an expected range for such coatings. This point notwithstanding, the prior art composition encompasses the claimed features of the present invention, and the prior composition is also sprayable. Thus, a reasonable basis exists to believe that the coating compositions of Graetz *et al.* possess the same rheological properties. The reference is also silent with respect to the dielectric constant of the composition. In view of the fact that the claimed material and that shown in the prior art are essentially the same, a reasonable basis exists to believe that it exhibits the same physical property. Since the PTO can not conduct experiments, the burden of proof is shifted to the Applicants to provide evidence to the contrary, and to establish an unobviousness difference. *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d. 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Art Unit: 1713

5. Claims 1-4 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,789,083 to Thomas.

The prior art of Thomas discloses a coating composition comprising a latex containing liquid, water, and the additives TiO_2 and BaSO_4 (see table, col. 4). The solids content of the latex is about 65.5 wt %. Graetz *et al.* is silent with respect to the viscosity of the coating compositions. The claimed range of 50-400 cP is unexceptional, and this is an expected range for such coatings. This point notwithstanding, the prior art composition encompasses the claimed features of the present invention, thus, a reasonable basis exists to believe that the coating compositions of Graetz *et al.* possess the same rheological properties. The reference is also silent with respect to the dielectric constant of the composition. In view of the fact that the claimed material and that shown in the prior art are essentially the same, a reasonable basis exists to believe that it exhibits the same physical property. Since the PTO can not conduct experiments, the burden of proof is shifted to the Applicants to provide evidence to the contrary, and to establish an unobviousness difference. *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d. 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Art Unit: 1713

Response to Arguments

6. The Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,390,658 to Graetz *et al.* The Applicant's arguments have been considered fully, but they are not persuasive.

The Applicants submit that Graetz *et al.* does not describe the dielectric properties of the inventive coating or how they may be modified.

That Graetz *et al.* is silent with respect to the dielectric properties was acknowledged previously. Following the examiner's proper establishment of a *prima facie* case of obviousness that the prior art material would also possess the claimed dielectric property, the burden of proof was shifted to the Applicants to establish an unobviousness difference. The Applicants have failed to meet this burden.

The Applicants also contend that there is no suggestion that pigment may be used to change the dielectric constant of the coating. The concept that an additive placed into a composition will naturally change the dielectric constant of that composition in an additive manner is well-established, and one skilled in the art readily appreciates this notion. Therefore, the Applicant's argument that Graetz *et al.* fails to teach this concept is not convincing.

In view of the discussion above, the rejection of record has not been withdrawn.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rip A. Lee whose telephone number is (703)306-0094. The examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (703)308-2450. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)746-7064. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

ral

November 12, 2002



DAVID W. WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700